

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-12 were pending in the application. New claims 13-16 are added.

Claims 1-12 are amended to recite language in conformity with U.S. practice and to correct errors in dependencies and lack of antecedent basis. Support for the amendments may be founding the claims as originally filed.

Claim 4 is amended to include the limitations of claim 1 and to recite method steps corresponding to the elements recited in claims 1. Support for the amendment may be found in the claims as originally filed.

Claim 7 is rewritten in independent form to recite a security system and to include the limitations of claim 1. New claim 13 is a method claim corresponding to claim 7, as amended.

New claim 14 is a method claim corresponding to claim 12. New claims 15 and 16 are a security system claim and corresponding method claim combining the limitations of claims 1, 4, and 6. No new matter is added.

The abstract is amended to remove reference to "invention." No new matter is added.

The specification is amended to remove references to specific claims, provide proper headings for sections of the specification, and to include reference to the claimed priority to a related application. No new matter is added.

### **Allowable Subject Matter**

Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating allowable subject matter in the present application. The Examiner has indicated that claim [7] would be allowable if rewritten to include the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

### **Objections to the Drawings**

The drawings are objected to because Figs. 5 and 6 do not include suitable description legends. The drawings are amended with replacement sheets of drawings for Figs. 5 and 6 that include descriptive legends. In view of the amendment to the drawings, Applicant respectfully requests that the objection to the drawings be withdrawn.

### **Claim Objections**

Claims 5-12 are objected to for reciting method claims while depending from claim 1, which recites a security system.

Claims 5, 6, and 8-11 are amended to correct their dependencies to method claims and to provide antecedent basis for terms in the claims. Claims 7 and 12 are amended to recite a security system. Support for the amendments may be found in the claims as originally filed.

In view of the amendments to claims 5-12, Applicant respectfully requests that the objections to these claims be withdrawn.

### **Claims Rejections 35 U.S.C. 102**

Claims 1-6 and 8-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Okamoto et al. (US 5,548,659). The Examiner's rejection has been carefully considered.

Present claim 1 recites a first function module having a light source and being configured to control the brightness of the light source. Column 5, lines 5-11 and Fig. 1 in Okamoto do not disclose an apparatus having a light source or an apparatus configured to control the brightness of such a light source. It appears that the cited reference only discloses taking pictures using whatever light is available external to the apparatus. Claim 4, as amended, recites a method corresponding to and including the limitations of claim 1.

Present claim 12 recites a security system in which the dependency of the noise variance on the gray value is ascertained for different parameters of the camera (3). Okamoto does not disclose this limitation. The cited reference, in Figure 2, discloses noise model parameters but not camera parameters.

The limitations recited in the present claims identify an invention that is functionally distinct from Okamoto. Okamoto discloses an apparatus and method in which the noise variance of the environment (such as a flickering fluorescent lamp) is determined. The presently claimed invention recites a security system and method wherein determining the noise variance involves a light source provided by the system and the brightness of the light being controlled by the system.

In view of the foregoing arguments and the amendments to the claims, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1-6 and 8-12 be withdrawn.

### Conclusion

The application in its amended state is believed to be in condition for allowance. Action to this end is courteously solicited. Should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, the undersigned would very much welcome a telephone call in order to discuss appropriate claim language that will place the application into condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'M. Striker', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Michael J. Striker  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No.: 27233  
103 East Neck Road  
Huntington, New York 11743  
631-549-4700